

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/980,809	RUDOLPH, DIETMAR
Examiner	Art Unit	
Alexander Jamal	2614	

All Participants:

Status of Application: non-final rejected

(1) Alexander Jamal.

(3) _____

(2) Erik R. Swanson (40833).

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 9 November 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner noted newly discovered prior art and asked applicant to show specification enablement for the terms "multi-stage modulator, internet, automatic switchover,frequency prognosis, database storage" which were used in the claims. Applicant stated that all the terms are well known terms and that it would have been obvious to apply thos known concepts to applicant's claimed invention. Examiner noted that he would read each of those terms as being obvious to apply any of those terms to any invention or system in the same field.